



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_15864
Title of the Manuscript:	Comprehensive Roles ofTP53 in Cell Signaling, Apoptosis, and Carcinogenesis – A Review
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	- Many words are linked together without space, and this made this article very difficult to read. Some examples are listed below; the author should go through the whole article thoroughly to avoid all the linked words. Line 32: "multiplyingexcessively" should be "multiplying excessively" Line 35: "justa" should be "just a" Line 37: "Suchsituation" should be "Such situation" Line 38: "complicatedseries" should be "complicated series" - Figures are not clear enough to be published on the journal, and the descriptions of the figures in the article are not fit the figure contents. - The English is not very smooth, and the article is difficult to read. The text needs comprehensive linguistic revision to let audiences get the actual point of view. - Some references are inappropriate sited in the article, and many sentences and descriptions lack appropriate references. Some examples are listed:	Thank you for your precious comments. Due to some technical problems the manuscript contained combined words. As far as recent literature is concerned so this manuscript is drafted to keep in view the basics of p53 and its associated processes, which can help a researcher to have a general overview of this gene and its expression. Some of the figures are replaced with the good resolution ones, along with their references. All the possible changes have been made



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 35-37: “Nature. 1990 Dec 20-27;348(6303):747-9.Germ-line transmission of a mutated p53 gene in a cancer-prone family with Li-Fraumeni syndrome.” should be cited. Line 393: MI219 –“Cancer BiolTher. 2010 Dec 15;10(12):1315-25. Epub 2010 Dec 15.MDM-2 antagonists induce p53-dependent cell cycle arrest but not cell death in renal cancer cell lines.” and “HematolOncol. 2012 Sep 18;5:57. doi: 10.1186/1756-8722-5-57.HDM2 antagonist MI-219 (spiro-oxindole), but not Nutlin-3 (cis-imidazoline), regulates p53 through enhanced HDM2 autoubiquitination and degradation in human malignant B-cell lymphomas.”should be cited. Line 394: tenovin– “Cancer Cell. 2008 May;13(5):454-63. doi: 10.1016/j.ccr.2008.03.004.Discovery, in vivo activity, and mechanism of action of a small-molecule p53 activator.“should be cited. Line 390-391: Phikan083 and CP-31398 are lack of references. 5. All gene name of <i>TP53</i> should be <i>italic</i>, and the protein names of TP53 (p53) should be write without italic. All TP53 should be carefully checked through whole manuscript. 6. All abbreviation should have a full name when	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	first shown in the article. 7. The order of some paragraphs should be changed to meet the logic, such as line 83-107 should be moved to the beginning of 2 (line 69) to describe the physiological roles of p53. 8. In section 4, the author listed some specific cancers in the content, such as “From line 274-280: There have been promising findings with respect to the survival prediction by TP53 mutations. For tumors of the head and neck, breast, liver, lymphoid systems, and hematopoietic, a majority of researches depict a connection of TP53 mutation with worsened survival. For tumors of the brain, bladder, lung, esophagus, colon, and ovary, about as many researches found a link as did not. For tumors of the prostate gland, pancreas, stomach, and rectum, the number of patients in the respective units reported was small. The largest patient units have been diagnosed for colorectal and breast carcinomas.”. It is ok to list colorectal and breast cancer in 4.1 and 4.2, but there is no reason to specify the list of other cancers in the following 4.3-4.5, especially the lung cancer is not so related to TP53 mutation as mentioned in Line 277. 9. Line 200: Nonetheless, some kinds of cancer have a low rate of occurrence of TP53 deletion or mutation (cervical and breast cancer), and this malfunctioning is not always linked with a substandard prognosis. Line 275: For tumors of the head and neck, breast, liver, lymphoid systems, and hematopoietic, a majority of researches depict a connection of TP53	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	mutation with worsened survival. Since breast cancer has low rate of TP53 deletion or mutation in line 200, why the author mentioned that breast cancer has a connection of TP53 mutation and set a paragraph in 4.2 to describe the relation between TP53 and breast cancers? Also, these two sentences listed above lack proper references. 10. Line 364: In a model of mouse with an Nterminal deletion mutant of p53 (_122p53) that correlates to the _133p53, Slatter et al. showed that these mouse had reduced survival, more aggressive and different tumor spectrum, a marked proliferative benefit on cells, decreased apoptosis and a complex proinflammatory phenotype [32]. This can be explained with figure 2, and the author should put some explanations for figure 2 in the article or the figure legend to make audiences more clear about the content of figure 2. 11. Line 409: growth (William & Prives, 2012). The reference is not added into the article. 12. What are “substandard prognosis” and “substandard survival”? Author should explain those terms in the text.	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The context of this article is not well organized to present a novel idea or new aspects in this area about T53. There are too many strange sentences with non-appropriate references or explanations. This article makes me feel more confused in the field of TP53. The order of each paragraph should be re-ordered and the whole article should be modified with professionallanguage editing. The descriptions of references should be more accurate.	